

INDOT 2030 LRP Update Early Coordination Meeting Notes:

Lafayette MPO, July 13, 2004, 2:00 PM

Attendees:

Dan Buck	INDOT - Long range Planning Section
Jan Mills	Mayor - West Lafayette
Opal Kuhl	Lafayette City Engineer
Dave Buck	West Lafayette Engineer
Brian Weber	APC of Tippecanoe County
Jim Knapp	Purdue Physical Facilities
Sallie Fahey	MPO – Executive Director
Doug Poad	APTC MPO Staff
David Whitworth	INDOT – Crawfordsville District
Steve Isenhower	INDOT – Crawfordsville District
John Metzinger	CityBus
Steve Smith	INDOT – Long Range Planning Section
Jamie Gallagher	INDOT – Program Development Division
Mark Albers	County Highway Director
Ruth Shadd	County Commissioner

Overview: Steve Smith kicked the meeting off discussing the meeting's purpose and expected outcome. The outline of the meeting was structured based on Lafayette's response to the Early Coordination 2004 Long Range Plan Update letter sent to Lafayette in April. This letter requested INDOT Districts and MPO personnel to reevaluate major expansion projects in the INDOT 25-year plan for their areas and document changes in project priorities (changes in scope, and/or project deletion, delay, or advancement); identify new expansion projects to be evaluated for inclusion in INDOT's 2030 plan update; and develop a list of planning issues the MPO/District faces that should be addressed in the 2030 plan update. Listed below are topics/issues discussed.

Dan Buck then presented the INDOT Travel Demand Model 2030 No-Build and Build LOS maps and the HERS 2030 Recommended Improvements Number of Lanes and Improvement Time Period maps.

MPO Issues/Concerns:

SR 43 from CR 725N to County Line: The MPO states there is more traffic being generated up to the county line. The initial INDOT engineers report calls for ATLs north up to CR 900, but not to the county line. The INDOT HERS analysis show recommendation for ATL further north than CR 900 but not up the county line. Our INDOT travel demand model again shows ATLs needed north but not up to the county line.

Comment: INDOT will wait for the INDOT engineers report to be finalized before making a final decision on the ending termini for the ATL work.

US 231 Extension from I-65 over to SR 43: The MPO is requesting that US 231 be continued eastward from the current proposed interchange at I-65 over to connect to SR 43. They believe traffic that currently travels south on SR 43 then west into the Purdue area would be diverted by a new connection of SR 43 to I-65.

Comment: INDOT will analyze a possible connection of I-65 over to SR 43 in our travel demand model to see what travel patterns emerge. Our current models don't show a specific need but we have not included a new connection of SR 43 and I-65. The MPO has also offered to supply us with their data regarding a connection of I-65 and SR 43. It may be best for this project to be deferred until the next INDOT LRP update.

I-65 Widening from SR 43 North to County Line: The MPO request INDOT continuing the widening of I-65 north of the current widening up to the county line. They believe traffic will increase in this area in the future.

Comment: Our INDOT Travel Demand Model LOS Maps and HERS Added Lanes Modeling do not show a need for additional widening on I-65 at that location. However, we will re-look at the travel demand needs for the section of I-65 from SR 43 up to the new connection of I-65 and US 231.

SR 25 Rerouting over to CR 350: There has been a proposal to reroute SR 25 from US 231 to CR 475 east. This rerouting has been a part of the discussions regarding the extensive new US 231 work that INDOT has been doing.

Comment: There have been many discussions with our Relinquishments Section regarding the rerouting of SR 25 over onto CR 350 dating back to 1996. At times there appears to be an agreement on the issue and then other times it appears there is no agreement. At this meeting the MPO appeared to be against the rerouting of the roadway at this time. There was substantial discussion regarding details and possibilities for the rerouting but no agreement was reached.

Prophet State Park Entrance: The DNR prepared a plan in 1998 for an entrance into the new Prophet State Park. This entrance would most likely be a connection to SR 43.

Comment: INDOT will contact DNR and see what their latest plan is for an entrance to the state park.

SR 25 from US 231 West to CR 375: The MPO believes this section of roadway is having increasing traffic growth problems. There is also a problem with a bridge in the area as well as access to the Eli Lilly facility. The current infrastructure limits growth.

Comment: Our LOS and HERS analysis show deficiencies at this segment of roadway. The District has proposed a bridge replacement project but it was initially rejected as it was for a railroad bridge only. We will continue to analyze this location and the District may propose a road project for this area.

Purdue Traffic Plan: Purdue University has developed a traffic plan for the entire campus and surrounding area with proposals for various roadways. The proposal includes a ring around the campus. The final plan document will be completed in about two months. The MPO will include the Purdue Plan into their LRP.

Comment: INDOT will review the plan once it is completed and incorporated into the MPO LRP.

Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Issues: The MPO is working on an ITS plan for the MPO, E.G. coordination and interconnection of signals during Purdue Football games.

Comment: INDOT will coordinate closely with the MPO on any ITS issues and provide technical assistance as appropriate.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Issues: The MPO would like to see some language regarding the involvement of bicycle/pedestrian issues incorporated into the INDOT LRP. They would like to see some references to this issue especially as it relates to projects on state roads.

Comment: INDOT incorporates bicycle and pedestrian issues and considerations during the planning studies and design engineering phases of individual projects. We will have a general reference to bicycle and pedestrian issues in our Intermodal discussions of the LRP but project specific language will still be contained within individual project studies and reports.